

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF**O'NEIL O. MORGAN****ON BEHALF OF****THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF****DOCKET NOS. 2021-143-E and 2021-144-E**

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND OCCUPATION.**

2 A. My name is O'Neil O. Morgan. My business address is 1401 Main Street, Suite
3 900, Columbia, South Carolina 29201. I am employed by the State of South Carolina as a
4 Senior Engineer in the Utility Rates and Services Division of the Office of Regulatory Staff
5 ("ORS").

6 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.**

7 A. I received a Bachelor of Engineering degree in Mechanical Engineering from the
8 University of Technology, Jamaica in 2006 and a Master of Science degree in Engineering
9 Management from Florida International University in 2008. I have worked in the energy
10 industry for over sixteen (16) years and prior to my employment at ORS, served in a variety
11 of positions developing and implementing energy efficiency ("EE") and demand side
12 management ("DSM" and together with EE, "EE/DSM") programs for multiple investor-
13 owned utilities in the United States. My responsibilities included providing guidance and
14 recommendations on various technical issues relating to EE program implementation,
15 baseline determination, energy impact estimation algorithms, rebate processes, and
16 responding to measurement and verification evaluators and Public Service Commission
17 staff. I joined ORS in November 2019 and assumed my current position.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA (“COMMISSION”)?

A. Yes. I have testified on multiple occasions before the Commission in matters related to annual fuel clause and avoided costs proceedings.

Q. WHAT IS THE MISSION OF ORS?

A. ORS represents the public interest as defined by the South Carolina General Assembly in S.C. Code Ann. § 58-4-10 as:

[T]he concerns of the using and consuming public with respect to public utility services, regardless of the class of customer, and preservation of continued investment in and maintenance of utility facilities so as to provide reliable and high-quality utility services.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING, AND HOW DOES YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY REPRESENT THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

A. The purpose of my direct testimony is to set forth ORS’s recommendations resulting from the examination of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC’s (“DEC”) and Duke Energy Progress, LLC’s (“DEP” and together with DEC, “Duke” or the “Companies”) Applications for approval of Smart Saver Solar as EE Programs (“Programs”) and compliance with certain sections of the South Carolina Energy Freedom Act (“Act 62”). By reviewing the Companies’ Applications to ensure compliance with applicable statutes and Commission Orders, reviewing the proposed Programs for additional recovery of net energy metering (“NEM”) lost revenues and shareholder incentives, and considering whether the Programs are cost-effective such that residential customers see a greater benefit than additional costs, my direct testimony promotes the public interest.

Q. DID YOU INCLUDE ANY EXHIBITS WITH YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes. I have included four (4) exhibits with my direct testimony labeled as Exhibits OOM-1 through OOM-4. The exhibits include various discovery data responses provided by the Companies which support my direct testimony.

Q. WAS THE REVIEW PERFORMED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION?

A. Yes. The review to which I testify was performed by me or under my supervision.

Q. DID ORS RETAIN ANY EXPERT WITNESSES FOR THIS PROCEEDING?

A. Yes. ORS retained an expert witness for this proceeding: Mr. Brian Horii, a Senior Partner with Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. ("E3").

Q. WHAT DOES MR. HORII ADDRESS IN HIS DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Mr. Horii discusses E3's analysis, review and recommendations regarding the Applications filed by Duke in these dockets to establish EE incentive programs for residential solar photovoltaic ("PV") customer-generators.

Q. WHAT ARE ORS'S CONCERNS WITH THE PROPOSED SOLAR PV CUSTOMER-GENERATOR PROGRAMS AS EE/DSM PROGRAMS?

A. ORS has several concerns with the proposed Programs as EE/DSM Programs:

1. It is not proper to classify customer-generator Solar PV systems as EE;
2. Duke's proposed Programs create significant additional customer costs;
3. The additional costs imposed on non-solar residential customers are unwarranted; and
4. Duke's cost-effectiveness test results contain serious flaws.

Q. WHAT IS ORS'S OVERALL RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE PROGRAMS PROPOSED BY THE COMPANIES IN THESE DOCKETS?

A. Due to the concerns identified above, and as set forth in my direct testimony and in the direct testimony of ORS witness Horii, ORS recommends that the Companies' request for approval of the Programs be denied.

CUSTOMER-GENERATOR SOLAR PV SYSTEMS CLASSIFIED AS EE

Q. WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF EE?

A. The United States Energy Information Administration ("EIA") definition and example of EE states:

Energy efficiency is using technology that **requires less energy to perform the same function**. Using a light-emitting diode (LED) light bulb or a compact fluorescent light (CFL) bulb that requires less energy than an incandescent light bulb to produce the same amount of light is an example of energy efficiency.¹ (Emphasis added)

The North Carolina Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard ("REPS"), section § 62-133.8 (a)(4), provides another representative definition of EE:

Energy efficiency measure means an equipment, physical, or program change implemented after January 1, 2007, **that results in less energy used to perform the same function**. "Energy efficiency measure" includes, but is not limited to, energy produced from a combined heat and power system that uses nonrenewable energy resources. Energy efficiency measure does not include demand-side management. (Emphasis added)

ORS includes North Carolina's definition because of Duke's multi-jurisdictional operation of its electrical system across both South Carolina and North Carolina. The Companies' EE/DSM programs are intended to mirror each other across both States. In order to be viable and implemented system wide, the proposed Programs will require not

¹ EIA "Use of energy explained, Energy efficiency and conservation", <https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/use-of-energy/efficiency-and-conservation.php>

1 only the approval of this Commission but also approval by the North Carolina Utility
2 Commission.

3 Simply put, the installation of a solar PV customer-generator system does not fit
4 the EIA and other definitions of EE. Customer-sited solar PV is a **source** of energy and in
5 no way reduces the consumption of any end-use household equipment for the customer-
6 generator. Therefore, the Companies should not be allowed to claim for EE purposes the
7 energy savings resulting from solar PV customer-generators simply because the customer-
8 generators' financial investment reduces the reliance on the Companies to provide energy.
9 ORS witness Horii provides additional support to reject the classification of Solar PV as
10 EE.

11 **Q. ARE REGULATED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN OTHER STATE JURISDICTIONS**
12 **OFFERING SIMILAR SOLAR PV AS EE PROGRAMS TO THOSE PROPOSED**
13 **BY THE COMPANIES?**

14 A. No, the Companies' proposals appear to be a first of their kind. ORS identified no
15 similar programs in its research, and by Duke's own admission, it also is unaware of any
16 similar programs in other state jurisdictions.² If approved by the Commission, DEC and
17 DEP would be the first and only regulated electric utilities in the nation permitted to include
18 solar PV customer-generator systems as EE. The Programs are truly novel and involve
19 significant potential costs to customers that Duke has not justified.

² Responses to ORS Data Requests 1-14 (Exhibit OOM-1).

COST IMPACT TO CUSTOMERS OF THE COMPANIES' PROPOSED PROGRAMS

**Q. WHAT COSTS WILL DUKE BE ELIGIBLE TO RECOVER FROM CUSTOMERS
IF THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS ARE APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION?**

A. If the proposed Programs are approved, the Companies will be eligible to recover all expenses incurred as a result of the implementation of the Programs under the existing EE/DSM Recovery Mechanisms most recently approved in Commission Order Nos. 2021-32 and 2021-33. These costs include:

1. Program costs and additional solar PV customer-generator incentives associated with the implementation of the Programs;
2. Net Lost Revenues ("NLR")³ associated with the implementation of EE measures for the first thirty-six (36) months; and
3. Portfolio Performance Incentive ("PPI")⁴ of 10.6%.

It is clear that the cost impact from the proposed Solar PV as EE Programs will increase the current EE/DSM Riders for the Companies.

**Q. HAS DUKE ESTIMATED THE ADDITIONAL COSTS THAT WILL BE
INCURRED IF THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS ARE APPROVED?**

A. Yes. DEC estimates an additional \$6,733,203 and DEP estimates an additional \$890,836 in costs will be incurred over the next five (5) years if the proposed Programs are implemented.⁵ These estimated costs will be recovered from all residential customers and

³ NLR ensure "that the net income of an electrical or gas utility regulated by the Commission after implementation of specific cost-effective energy conservation measures is at least as high as the net income would have been if energy conservation measures had not been implemented." (S.C. Code Ann. § 58-37-20)

⁴ PPI is a 10.6% shareholder incentive on the net dollar savings of the Companies' EE/DSM portfolio, as calculated using the Utility Cost Test.

⁵ Responses to ORS Data Requests 1-22 (Exhibit OOM-2).

will be in addition to the current costs to be recovered for EE/DSM which total \$80,028,532 for DEC⁶ and \$37,477,937 for DEP⁷ customers. For both Companies, residential customers will pay approximately 47% (DEC) and 52% (DEP) of these large existing EE/DSM Program balances. Table 1 and Table 2 below provide a breakdown of the costs to be recovered from DEC and DEP customers.

Table 1: South Carolina Costs to be Recovered from DEC Customers

	Program Costs	NLR	PPI	South Carolina Total Costs	South Carolina Residential
Docket No. 2021-76-E	\$46,847,085	\$25,289,890	\$7,891,556	\$80,028,532	\$37,734,625
Current Docket No. 2021-144-E	\$3,193,432	\$3,015,969	\$523,802	\$6,733,203	\$6,733,203

Beginning January 1, 2022, DEC residential customers will pay .5769 cents per kilowatt-hour (“¢/kWh”). For an average DEC residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month, the customer will pay approximately \$5.77 per month for DEC’s existing EE/DSM programs, participating or not. The proposed Programs would increase this amount with approximately an additional \$3,539,771, or 53% of the new proposed total costs, going to DEC’s shareholders in the form of NLR and PPI.

⁶ Docket No. 2021-76-E, effective January 1, 2022.

⁷ Docket No. 2021-243-E, currently pending before the Commission. ORS report and intervenor comments are due to be filed on October 15, 2021, with cost recovery effective January 1, 2022, if approved.

Table 2: South Carolina Costs to be Recovered from DEP Customers

	Program Costs	NLR	PPI	South Carolina Total Costs	South Carolina Residential
Docket No. 2021-243-E	\$28,530,347	\$6,641,672	\$2,305,918	\$37,477,937	\$19,613,910
Current Docket No. 2021-143-E	\$318,069	\$539,708	\$33,059	\$890,836	\$890,836

Currently, DEP residential customers pay .647 ¢/kWh. If the EE/DSM cost recovery application currently before this Commission is approved the rate would increase to .829 ¢/kWh beginning January 1, 2022. For an average DEP residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month, the customer would pay approximately \$8.29 per month for DEP's existing EE/DSM programs, participating or not. The proposed Programs would increase this amount with approximately an additional \$572,767, or 64% of the total costs, going to DEP's shareholders in the form of NLR and PPI.

Q. WHAT OTHER CONCERN DOES ORS HAVE WITH THE POTENTIAL COSTS TO BE RECOVERED BY DUKE IF THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS ARE APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION?

A. As stated above, DEC estimates an additional \$6,733,203 and DEP estimates an additional \$890,836 in additional costs will be incurred over the next five (5) years if the proposed Programs are implemented. These cost figures include NLR of approximately \$3,015,969 (44% of total costs) for DEC and \$539,708 (61% of total costs) for DEP. If the Commission considers the proposed Programs, ORS recommends that NLR associated

with the proposed Programs be excluded from any sort of cost recovery by the Companies.

It is ORS's position that cost recovery of NLR is not in compliance with S.C. Code Ann.

§ 58-40-20(I) of Act 62, which states:

Nothing in this section, however, prohibits an electrical utility from continuing to recover distributed energy resource program costs in the manner and amount approved by Commission Order No. 2015-194 for customer-generators applying before June 1, 2021. Such recovery shall remain in place until full cost recovery is realized. **Electrical utilities are prohibited from recovering lost revenues associated with customer-generators who apply for customer-generator programs on or after June 1, 2021.** (Emphasis added)

ADDITIONAL COSTS FOR

NON-SOLAR RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS

Q. DOES THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE COMPANY DEMONSTRATE THAT CUSTOMER-GENERATORS REQUIRE ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL INCENTIVES TO ADOPT SOLAR PV?

A. No. ORS reviewed the Companies' Applications and data request responses and found no support that additional financial incentives are needed to entice customers to install solar PV. Based on the Companies' interconnection trends, the recent Commission approval and availability of the Solar Choice Metering tariffs,⁸ and the new customer-generator interconnection applications received since June 1, 2021, ORS concludes that further financial incentives will not increase, in any material way, the adoption of solar PV by residential customers.

Q. WHAT IS THE COMPANIES' PROJECTED CUSTOMER PARTICIPATION IN THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS?

⁸ Effective for residential applicants applying on or after June 1, 2021.

1 A. Based on the Companies' data responses, the Companies project that 3,112
2 customers will participate in the DEC proposed Program and 595 customers will participate
3 in the DEP proposed Program over a five (5) year period beginning January 1, 2022.⁹ On
4 an annual basis, that equates to an average increase of 622 and 119 customers participating
5 in the Companies' proposed Programs each year, respectively.

6 **Q. HOW MANY SOLAR PV CUSTOMER-GENERATORS HAVE ALREADY**
7 **APPLIED FOR NEM UNDER THE NEW SOLAR CHOICE METERING TARIFFS**
8 **SINCE JUNE 1, 2021?**

9 A. As of August 31, 2021, DEC received 454 applications and DEP received 86
10 applications for the new Solar Choice Metering tariffs since June 1, 2021.¹⁰ The current
11 number of applicants for each Company indicates that the incentives contained in the
12 current Solar Choice Metering tariffs are sufficient and adequate to encourage continued
13 adoption of residential solar PV. The Companies' response also supports the ORS
14 conclusion that the additional financial incentives proposed by the Programs will cause an
15 increase in free riders, which will increase costs for all of Duke's residential customers.
16 The subject of free riders is addressed in more detail in the direct testimony of ORS witness
17 Horii.

18 **Q. WHAT TYPES OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE**
19 **TO SOUTH CAROLINA RESIDENTS INTERESTED IN BECOMING SOLAR PV**
20 **CUSTOMER- GENERATORS?**

⁹ Responses to ORS Data Requests 1-3 (Exhibit OOM-3).

¹⁰ Response to ORS Data Request 4-5 (Exhibit OOM-4).

A. The Companies' residential customers interested in generating their own electricity from solar PV systems have many opportunities for financial incentives to encourage solar PV system installation. Below is a list of some of the financial incentives currently available to South Carolina residents:

1. State Income Tax Credit: Eligible South Carolina residents can receive 25% of the costs of installing a solar PV system, up to \$3,500 per tax year. The resident can carry any excess above \$3,500 for up to ten (10) years.
2. Federal Residential Solar Energy Credit: The Federal government provides a tax credit of 26% (it is expected that this will be reduced to 22% in 2023) of the cost paid by a resident to install a solar PV system. This tax credit can offset taxes owed or be taken by the resident as a refund.
3. Property Tax Exemption for Renewable Energy (H.3354): Provides a property tax exemption for solar PV systems (<20kW) placed on the rooftops of residential homes.
4. Solar Choice Metering Tariffs: The next generation of NEM offers residential customers, but is not limited to, time-variant pricing structures to include critical peak pricing, monthly netting with net exports credited at avoided cost, and the use of self-generated energy behind the meter without penalty.

Other incentives such as the Clean Electricity Payment Program are also currently under consideration in Congress and may become available in the near future.

Q. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CHANGES IN THE MARKETPLACE THAT ALSO WOULD ENCOURAGE CUSTOMERS TO ADOPT SOLAR PV?

1 A. Yes. The cost of solar PV equipment has fallen substantially over the last decade.
2 The National Renewable Energy Laboratory in its Q1 2020 report, "U.S. Solar Photovoltaic
3 System and Energy Storage Cost Benchmark,"¹¹ showed a 64% reduction in the residential
4 solar PV system cost benchmark from 2010-2020. As solar PV equipment prices continue
5 to decline, more and more residential customers will be financially able to afford the
6 opportunity to install solar PV systems on their homes.

7 **Q. WILL NON-SOLAR RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS BE EXPECTED TO PAY FOR**
8 **THE COSTS OF ADDITIONAL INCENTIVES FOR SOLAR PV**
9 **CUSTOMER-GENERATORS IF THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS ARE**
10 **APPROVED?**

11 A. Yes. If the Commission approves the Companies' proposed Programs, the inclusion
12 of the proposed Programs as EE will introduce and shift unwarranted costs to the
13 Companies' non-solar residential customers. And, the Programs will provide the
14 Companies' shareholders additional NLR and PPI through the existing EE/DSM Recovery
15 Mechanisms, which will be paid for by all of Duke's South Carolina residential customers.
16 The Companies have provided no evidence that justifies the implementation of the
17 proposed Programs and, therefore, these cost shifts would be unwarranted.

18 **DUKE'S COST-EFFECTIVENESS TEST RESULTS**

19 **Q. DOES ORS AGREE WITH THE COST-EFFECTIVENESS TEST RESULTS OF**
20 **THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS PROVIDED BY DUKE?**

¹¹ <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/77324.pdf>

A. No. ORS found the Companies' cost-effectiveness test results to be flawed in several important respects. ORS witness Horii discusses these flaws in detail in his direct testimony.

CONCLUSION

Q. DOES ORS HAVE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE COMPANIES' PROPOSED SMART SAVER SOLAR AS EE PROGRAMS?

A. Yes. ORS recommends the Commission deny the Companies' requests. Customer-sited solar PV systems are not EE measures, there is no evidence that customer or Company incentives are necessary to encourage installation of solar PV, certain costs requested are not permissible for recovery under Act 62, and the Companies' cost-effectiveness test results are flawed in several important respects.

Q. WILL YOU UPDATE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY BASED ON INFORMATION THAT BECOMES AVAILABLE?

A. Yes. ORS fully reserves the right to revise its recommendations via supplemental testimony should new information not previously provided by the Company, or other sources, becomes available.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

**Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 1-14**

Docket No. 2021-144-E

**Date of Request: May 14, 2021
Date of Response: June 3, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Lynda Shafer, Sr Strategy & Collaboration Manager, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
First Request for Production of Books
Records and Other Information
DEC Solar as EE-Docket No. 2021-144-E
Item No. 1-14
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC

Request:

1-14 Identify and list other electric utilities in other state jurisdictions that offers a similar Proposed Program.

Response:

The Company is unaware of a similar program in other state jurisdictions.

**Duke Energy Progress, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 1-14**

Docket No. 2021-143-E

**Date of Request: May 14, 2021
Date of Response: June 3, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Lynda Shafer, Sr Strategy & Collaboration Manager, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Progress, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
First Request for Production of Books
Records and Other Information
DEP Solar as EE-Docket No. 2021-143-E
Item No. 1-14
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC

Request:

1-14 Identify and list other electric utilities in other state jurisdictions that offers a similar Proposed Program.

Response:

The Company is unaware of a similar program in other state jurisdictions.

**Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 1-22**

Docket No. 2021-144-E

**Date of Request: May 14, 2021
Date of Response: June 3, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Lynda Shafer, Sr Strategy & Collaboration Manager, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
First Request for Production of Books
Records and Other Information
DEC Solar as EE-Docket No. 2021-144-E
Item No. 1-22
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC

Request:

1-22 Will the Company seek to recover portfolio performance incentives, program return incentives, and net lost revenues relating to the Proposed Program? If so, what is the overall impact to the DSM/EE rider for customers?

Response:

The Company will seek to recover the applicable portfolio performance incentives, or program return incentives, as well as net lost revenues relating to the Proposed Program in accordance with the Revised Mechanism which is effective January 1, 2022. The projected impact to the rider for each vintage year is in the attached spreadsheet.



DEC DEP DR Total
Impact by Vintage Year

**Duke Energy Progress, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 1-22**

Docket No. 2021-143-E

**Date of Request: May 14, 2021
Date of Response: June 3, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Lynda Shafer, Sr Strategy & Collaboration Manager, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Progress, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
First Request for Production of Books
Records and Other Information
DEP Solar as EE-Docket No. 2021-143-E
Item No. 1-22
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC

Request:

1-22 Will the Company seek to recover portfolio performance incentives, program return incentives, and net lost revenues relating to the Proposed Program? If so, what is the overall impact to the DSM/EE rider for customers?

Response:

The Company will seek to recover portfolio performance incentives, program return incentives, and net lost revenues relating to the Proposed Program in accordance with the Revised Mechanism which is effective January 1, 2022. The projected impact to the rider for each vintage year is in the attached spreadsheet.



DEC DEP DR Total
Impact by Vintage Year

Measure Name	Incremental Participation	Free-Rider %	Admin Costs		Implementation Costs		Incentive Costs		Other Utility Costs		Total Program Costs		Net kWh @Meter - VY-1		Net kWh @Meter - VY-2		Net kWh @Meter - VY-3		Net kWh @Meter - VY-4		Net Fuel LR - VY-1		Net Fuel LR - VY-2		Net Fuel LR - VY-3		Net Fuel LR - VY-4		NPV Avoided Energy		NPV Avoided Capacity		NPV Avoided T&D		Total NPV Avoided Cost																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
			D35	D35	CE6	CF6	CG6	CH6	CI6	BG6	BG7	BG8	BG9	CB6	CB7	CB8	CB9	CB10	CB11	CB12	CB13	CB14	CB15	CB16	CB17	CB18	CB19	CB20	CB21	CB22	CB23	CB24	CB25	CB26	CB27	CB28	CB29	CB30																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
																																							1	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

**Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 1-3**

Docket No. 2021-144-E

**Date of Request: May 14, 2021
Date of Response: June 3, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Bill Eberle, Lead DSM & Retail Programs Analyst, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
First Request for Production of Books
Records and Other Information
DEC Solar as EE-Docket No. 2021-144-E
Item No. 1-3
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC

Request:

- 1-3 Provide the Company's forecast of the expected number of customer participants and the additional customer solar generation in MW that will be added to the Company's system with the approval of the Proposed Program.

Response:

The Company projects 3112 customer participants and 31 MWs of additional solar capacity associated with Proposed Program.

**Duke Energy Progress, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 1-3**

Docket No. 2021-143-E

**Date of Request: May 14, 2021
Date of Response: June 3, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Bill Eberle, Lead DSM & Retail Programs Analyst, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Progress, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
First Request for Production of Books
Records and Other Information
DEP Solar as EE-Docket No. 2021-143-E
Item No. 1-3
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC

Request:

- 1-3 Provide the Company's forecast of the expected number of customer participants and the additional customer solar generation in MW that will be added to the Company's system with the approval of the Proposed Program.

Response:

The Company projects 595 customer participants resulting in 6 MWs of additional solar capacity associated with Proposed Program.

**Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC and Duke Energy Progress, LLC's
Response to
SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Data Request No. 4-5**

**Docket No. 2021-143-E
Docket No. 2021-144-E**

**Date of Request: September 1, 2021
Date of Response: September 10, 2021**

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

☒

NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential Responses are provided pursuant to Confidentiality Agreement

The attached response to SC Office of Regulatory Staff, was provided to me by the following individual(s): Jason D. Martin, DET Strategy & Policy Director, and was provided to the SC Office of Regulatory Staff under my supervision.

Samuel J. Wellborn
Counsel
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC & Duke Energy
Progress, LLC

SC Office of Regulatory Staff
Fourth Audit Request for Records
and Information
DEC Solar as EE-Docket 2021-144-E
DEP Solar as EE-Docket 2021-143-E
Item No. 4-5
Page 1 of 1

DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC & DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC

Request:

4-5 How many customer-generators have applied for net metering under the new Solar Choice Metering tariffs since June 1, 2021?

Response:

As of August 31, 2021, DEC has received 454 applications and DEP has received 86 applications for the new Solar Choice Metering tariffs, since June 1, 2021.